



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,451	06/25/2003	Chang Heui Hong	2060-3-51	4369
35884	7590	01/26/2006		
LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA, P.C. 801 SOUTH FIQUEROA STREET 14TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90017			EXAMINER WANG, JIN CHENG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2672	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/603,451	Applicant(s) HONG, CHANG HEUI	
	Examiner Jin-Cheng Wang	Art Unit 2672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On Page 14, line 2 of the claim 27, “the display unit” should be “the display apparatus”, line 1, 3 and 5 of the claim 28, “the display unit” should be “the display apparatus”; line 3 of the claim 31, “the display unit” should be “the display apparatus”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims 27, 28 and 31 are objected to because of the following informalities: On Page 14, line 2 of the claim 27, “the display unit” should be “the display apparatus”, line 1, 3 and 5 of the claim 28, “the display unit” should be “the display apparatus”; line 3 of the claim 31, “the display unit” should be “the display apparatus”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-19, 21-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

For example, the base claim 1 recites “the display unit” twice. It cannot be ascertained whether “the display unit” refers to the same display unit because a display unit has a width and height and changing the orientation of the display unit also changes the width and height of the display unit. The metes and bounds of the coverage of at least base claim 1 cannot be ascertained.

For example, the base claim 21 (27, or 28) recites “the display apparatus”. It cannot be ascertained whether “the display apparatus” refers to the same display apparatus set forth in the claim 20 because a display apparatus has a width and height and changing the orientation of the display apparatus also changes the width and height of the display apparatus. The metes and bounds of the coverage of at least the claim 21 (27 or 28) cannot be ascertained.

To comply with the “written description” requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, an applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the “written description” inquiry, whatever is now claimed. *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991). For purposes of written description, one shows “possession” by descriptive means such as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Such descriptive means cannot be found in the disclosure for the inventions of the claims 1, 21, 27 and 28.

Claims 2-19 depend upon the base claim 1 and are rejected due to their dependency on the base claim 1.

The claims 22-26 depend upon the base claim 21 and are rejected due to their dependency on the claim 21.

The claims 29-31 depend upon the base claim 28 and are rejected due to their dependency on the claim 28.

The claims 32-36 depend upon the base claim 27 and are rejected due to their dependency on the claim 27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-19, 21-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

For example, the base claim 1 recites “the display unit” twice. It cannot be ascertained whether “the display unit” refers to the same display unit because a display unit has a width and height and changing the orientation of the display unit also changes the width and height of the display unit. The metes and bounds of the coverage of at least base claim 1 cannot be ascertained.

For example, the base claim 21 (27, or 28) recites “the display apparatus”. It cannot be ascertained whether “the display apparatus” refers to the same display apparatus set forth in the claim 20 because a display apparatus has a width and height and changing the orientation of the display apparatus also changes the width and height of the display apparatus. As regards to the

Art Unit: 2672

claim 28, "such that dimensions of the second image are proportionally reduced" is held to be indefinite because dimensions of the second image are not proportionally reduced when $C=A$ and $D=B$. The metes and bounds of the coverage of at least the claim 21 (27 or 28) cannot be ascertained.

Claims 2-19 depend upon the base claim 1 and are rejected due to their dependency on the base claim 1.

The claims 22-26 depend upon the base claim 21 and are rejected due to their dependency on the claim 21.

The claims 29-31 depend upon the base claim 28 and are rejected due to their dependency on the claim 28.

The claims 32-36 depend upon the base claim 27 and are rejected due to their dependency on the claim 27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Uyehara et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,154,214 (hereinafter Uyehara).

Re Claims 1-3 and 20-21:

Uyehara discloses a method of configuring an image displayed on a display unit of a mobile terminal comprising:

Rotating a first image displayed on the display unit (e.g., rotating the first image displayed on the Fig. 17), in a first direction (e.g., in a portrait mode), in response to user input to display a second image (in response to the user's pressing of the orientation key 80 to display a second image in landscape mode); and

Adjusting dimensional configuration of the second image (the dimensional configuration of the image displayed in Fig. 18 are different from the dimensional configuration of the first image displayed in Fig. 17 in the portrait mode) in accordance with dimensions of the display unit (the texts are redisplayed with the orientation shown in Fig. 18, see column 12. Adjusting the display orientation of the first image also adjusts the dimensional configuration of the second image in Fig. 18 in accordance with the width and height of the display unit).

Claim 2:

Uyehara further discloses the user input being provided by pressing an orientation key in a keypad of the mobile terminal (Fig. 17).

Claim 3:

Uyehara further discloses at least one direction key associated with a direction of rotation for the first image (e.g., the orientation key 80 is a direction key associated with a direction of rotation for the image displayed in Fig. 17).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-9, 14-16, 22-27 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uyehara et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,154,214 (hereinafter Uyehara).

Re Claims 4-9, 14-16, 22-27 and 32-34:

Uyehara discloses an orientation key 80 and a plurality of software controlled markers 240-246 in response to the pressing of the orientation key 80 to control the rotation orientation of the image. The plurality of markers are software control keys (soft keys) in which the user can tap or touch (e.g., column 12, lines 20-21 and column 12, lines 50-57). The plurality of markers include a first and second orientation markers performing the same function as the first and second direction keys of performing clockwise or counter-clockwise rotation of the image (See column 6, lines 10-36). The plurality of markers also include a third and fourth orientation markers performing the same function as the third and fourth direction keys of performing 180 degree rotation or 0 degree rotation to return to its original orientation (column 6, lines 21-36). These four markers are software controlled to indicate direction or orientation in which the first image in Fig. 17 is rotated. It would have been obvious to have modified the software controlled markers of Uyehara with either the any forms of keys. Whatever arrangement/placement of the keys on the mobile device do not matter as long as they are used to perform the same functions, i.e., rotating the image in clockwise direction, counter-clockwise direction etc. One of the ordinary skill in art realizes that locations for placing the keys on the mobile device can be

Art Unit: 2672

changed. As to the use of the keys instead of the orientation key in combination with the markers, one of the ordinary skill in the art realizes that markers are software controlled markers which can be tapped to issue commands to control the image orientation performing the same function of the keys. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to select a text orientation which corresponds to the user's preferred device orientation and gripping method (column 6, lines 21-36).

Claims 10-13, 19, 28-31 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uyehara et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,154,214 (hereinafter Uyehara) in view of Anderson et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,262,769 (hereinafter Anderson).

Re Claims 10-13, 19, 28-31 and 37:

Uyehara discloses the first image in Fig. 17 having a height C and a width D and the display unit of Fig. 18 has width A and a height B in which the height C of the image corresponds with the width A of the display and the width D of the image corresponds with the height B of the display. It would have been obvious to see from the image of Fig. 17 and the display unit of Fig. 18 to see $C = A$ and $B = D$. As regards to the claim 12-13 and 30-31, Anderson discloses in column 8, lines 23-38 rotating a portrait image onto a landscape oriented display in which the portrait image can be reduced in size to display the entire image on the display. Anderson also discloses a landscape image being displayed on a portrait oriented display in which the landscape image can have portions of the image cut to fit onto the portrait oriented display and the landscape oriented image can be reduced in size to fit onto a portrait oriented display. Therefore, Anderson teaches the claim limitations set forth in the claims 12-13 and 30-

Art Unit: 2672

31 in which $C=A$ & $B=D$ because the image of the size C & D are resized to fit onto the display of the size A & B . It would have been obvious to have incorporated Anderson into Uyehara because Anderson also teaches other claim limitations set forth in the independent claim 1 and 20 (See Anderson column 8). One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to resize or crop the image to fit the portrait image onto a landscape oriented display of a mobile device such as a digital camera (Anderson column 8).

Claims 17-18 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uyehara et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,154,214 (hereinafter Uyehara) in view of Hull et al. US Patent No. 6,720,863 (hereinafter Hull).

Re Claims 17-18 and 35-36:

Uyehara discloses the four markers performing the function of the keys. However, Uyehara is silent to the claim limitation of "flickers". Hull discloses in Fig. 8 that changing the color or shade of one or more virtual keys 855 of virtual keypad 853 being displayed by touch-screen LCD so that the light functions may animate a virtual key so that the virtual key flickers (Hull column 10-11). Therefore, having the combined teaching of Uyehara and Hull, it would have been obvious to have animated the markers of Uyehara so that the markers flickers which more prominently show the state of markers to indicate a state of conditions to the user. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to animate the keys in a virtual keypad on a mobile electronic communication device to indicate the different messages received from multiple contacts (Hull column 10).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jin-Cheng Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-7665. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 6:30 (Mon-Thu).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Razavi can be reached on (571) 272-7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jcw



MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISOR
EXAMINER
ER 2672